REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed August 14, 2006. Claims 1-16 were pending in the present application. This Amendment amends claims 1-2, 5-7, 10, and 13-14, without adding or canceling any claims, leaving pending in the application claims 1-16. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

I.   **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Lubbers* (US 6,947,981). Applicants respectfully submit that *Lubbers* does not disclose each element of these claims.

For example, Applicants' claim 1 as amended recites an information processing system, including:

> a **first information processing apparatus** having a first communication port for transmitting and receiving data;
> a **second information processing apparatus** having a second communication port for transmitting and receiving data; and
> a **communicating portion for executing bi-directional communication between the first communication port and the second communication port**, the information processing system comprising:
>> a utilizing portion for utilizing the communicating portion, for communication in a direction for which a **first application program run on the first information processing apparatus** sets the first communication port and the second communication port respectively as the sender and the destination of data;
>> another utilizing portion for utilizing the communicating portion, for communication in a direction for which a **second application program run on the second information processing apparatus** sets the second communication port and the first communication port respectively as the sender and the destination of data; and
>> a **path unit management table, each of the first and second application programs being operable to form and re-form a path for communication between the first and second information processing apparatus, thereby controlling a direction of communications in the path, by setting path information in the path unit management table**

(*emphasis added*). Such limitations are not disclosed by *Lubbers*.

For example, *Lubbers* discloses a flexible data replication management architecture including first and second storage cells separated over a network, each comprising a storage controller having first and second ports and a pool of storage devices accessible through the controller (col. 3, lines 57-63). Each of the first and second ports communicates both user and

Appl. No. 10/722,781
Amdt. dated November 13, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2188

PATENT

replication data with the communication network, and each storage cell operates both as a source and a destination, for initiating replication of data stored within its associated pool of storage devices, and for storing replicas of data stored in the storage devices of another storage cell (col. 3, line 63-col. 4, line 6). Each storage cell then can act as both a primary and a secondary location at the same time by holding replication data for other cells. In the event of a failure of a storage cell, the other storage cell(s) then can simply migrate data to the failed storage cell (col. 9, lines 24-32). *Lubbers* does not disclose or suggest a first application program forming a logic path on a physical path connecting the first and second information processing apparatus in a first direction by setting values in a path unit management table. *Lubbers* also does not disclose or suggest a second application re-forming the logic path in the opposite direction by setting values in the path management table. *Lubbers* further does not disclose or suggest any reforming of unidirectional logic paths by updating information in a path management table. *Lubbers* instead allows each cell to act both as a primary and secondary location, simultaneously providing data and data redundancy for other cells. As such, *Lubbers* cannot anticipate or render obvious Applicants' claim 1 or the claims that depend therefrom. Independent claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 13, and 14 recite limitations that similarly are not disclosed or suggested by *Lubbers* for reasons including those discussed above, such that these claims and the claims that depend therefrom also are not anticipated or rendered obvious by *Lubbers*. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections with respect to claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11, and 13-15 be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4, 9, 12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Lubbers* in view of *Elliott* (US 5,420,988). These claims depend from claims 2, 7, 10, and 14, respectively, which are not rendered obvious by *Lubbers* as discussed above. *Elliott* does not make up for the deficiencies in *Lubbers* with respect to these claims.

Elliott teaches the establishing and sharing of logical paths through a switch by multiple channels to multiple control units (col. 1, lines 53-58), and is cited as teaching controllers which

enable multiple logic paths between I/O devices (OA pp. 7-8). Such teaching still would not make up for the deficiencies in *Lubbers* with respect to these claims, however, as *Elliott* teaches sharing a logic path, but does not teach or suggest reforming unidirectional logic paths between two specific ports or two processing specific apparatus by updating information in a path management table. *Elliott* also does not teach or suggest a first application program forming a logic path on a physical path connecting the first and second information processing apparatus in a first direction by setting values in a path unit management table, as well as a second application re-forming the logic path in the opposite direction by setting values in the path management table. As such, *Elliott* cannot render these claims obvious, either alone or in combination with *Lubbers*. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections with respect to claims 4, 9, 12, and 16 be withdrawn.

III.   Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason D. Lohr
Reg. No. 48,163

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
JDL:slh

60905732 v1